

Debye screening and baryogenesis during the electroweak phase transition

Submitted to Physics Letters B

A. G. Cohen ^a

Physics Department

Boston University

Boston, MA 02215

D. B. Kaplan^{abc} and A. E. Nelson ^{bd}

Department of Physics

9500 Gilman Drive 0319

University of California, San Diego

La Jolla, CA 92093-0319

Abstract

We examine a recent claim that Debye screening will affect the charge transport mechanism of anomalous electroweak baryogenesis, and show that the effects of gauge charge screening do not affect the baryon number produced during a first order electroweak phase transition.

UCSD/PTH 92-19, BU-HEP-92-20

June 1992

Email: cohen@andy.bu.edu, dkaplan@ucsd.edu, anelson@ucsd.edu

^a DOE Outstanding Junior Investigator

^b Sloan Fellow

^c NSF Presidential Young Investigator

^d SSC fellow

The realization that the electroweak anomalous baryon violation is probably rapid enough to be cosmologically relevant at high temperatures [1-3] has led to several new proposals for weak scale baryogenesis [2,4-11] which may be testable at the SSC. In general, baryogenesis requires out of equilibrium CP violation as well as baryon number violation [12]. Departure from thermal equilibrium can result from a first order weak phase transition, occurring either in the standard model or in one of its extensions, which proceeds via nucleation and growth of bubbles of the Higgs phase. Many extensions of the standard model can contain sufficient CP violation to plausibly produce a baryon density to photon entropy ratio as large as the observed $\rho_B/s \sim 10^{-10}$ [6-10]. The mechanism through which weak scale baryogenesis can proceed depends on the thickness of the bubble walls produced during the phase transition, compared to relevant mean free paths¹. A generic mechanism for thick walls is spontaneous baryogenesis, first introduced to explain baryogenesis during a second order phase transition [17]. Spontaneous baryogenesis involves coherent effects of a time and space dependent scalar field acting as a charge potential. The baryon number is produced inside the bubble walls where scalar field expectation values (like the Higgs field vev) are changing, causing the free energy density inside the bubble walls to be minimized for nonzero baryon number [7-9]. However the anomalous baryon number violating processes have a rate per unit volume which, even at high temperatures, is rather slow, and ρ_B/s produced inside the walls turns out to be *at most* of order $(\alpha_{\text{wk}}^4/g_*)\delta_{CP} \sim 10^{-8}\delta_{CP}$. Here δ_{CP} is a reparametrization invariant CP violating phase and $g_* = \mathcal{O}(100)$ is the effective number of particle degrees of freedom at the electroweak transition [7-9,18,19].

We have proposed in refs. [6,10] a more efficient “charge transport mechanism” for producing baryon number during the electroweak phase transition in models with thin bubble walls. In a CP violating theory, the reflection probabilities from the phase boundary for left handed weak doublets and their CP conjugates are different, and so the bubble wall reflects a CP asymmetric distribution of particles into the unbroken phase. Anomalous baryon violating electroweak processes throughout a large region of the unbroken phase will be biased toward producing baryons wherever there is net lefthanded fermion number (i.e. where there are more righthanded antiquarks and antileptons than lefthanded quarks and

¹ Recent work on the standard model [13] and minimal supersymmetric standard model [14,15] suggests that the bubble walls there are thick, ($\sim (25 - 40)/T$). Baryogenesis arising from the singlet majoron model [6] can involve thin bubble walls ($\sim 1/T$) [16], as can generic models with several scalars.

leptons). This mechanism dominates over mechanisms which produce baryons only inside the bubble walls unless the walls are thicker than the relevant particle mean free paths (which are about $(1-10)/T$), because the anomalous baryon number violating processes are biased over a larger region. In ref. [10] we simulated the fermion reflection and scattering processes and found that a significant asymmetry in fermion quantum numbers extends in front of the wall over a volume considerably larger than the volume of the walls. We then showed that baryon to entropy ratios as large as $\sim 10^{-5}\delta_{CP}$ are possible in a two Higgs model if the thickness of the walls is of order the inverse top mass, and the walls are moving with velocities of order $0.1c$. However the charge density in the unbroken phase that we computed included a net hypercharge, and so one should consider the effects of Debye screening on the particle number distributions, and on baryogenesis [20,21]. In a recent quantitative analysis Khlebnikov has shown that it is not possible for a net gauge charge to penetrate into the unbroken phase further than the Debye screening length, unless the bubbles are expanding ultra-relativistically [21]. In this letter we examine the effects of hypercharge screening on baryogenesis and show that this screening has no effect on the baryon number produced during the transition, even in the limit of zero Debye length.

We wish to reconsider the mechanism of ref. [10] for baryogenesis in a first order weak phase transition. We showed that when bubbles of the broken phase nucleate and expand into the unbroken phase plasma, CP violation leads to different reflection probabilities for lefthanded fermions and their CP conjugates from the bubble wall. This CP violating effect can be large for top quarks in the two Higgs doublet model, or for higgsinos in supersymmetric models [10,15]. Thus the bubble walls reflect nonzero values for some quantum numbers into the unbroken phase. Furthermore, as we showed, the quantum numbers are typically carried by particles with large momenta, and numerical simulations find that the high momenta reflected particles penetrate a long distance, $\mathcal{O}(10-1000)/T$, into the unbroken phase before being rethermalized by particle scattering. Thus a CP violating asymmetry in particle quantum numbers extends over a large region in front of the advancing bubble wall, unless the walls are ultra-relativistic. The particle distribution functions in front of the wall will approach local thermal and chemical equilibrium, characterized by a temperature and by chemical potentials for the various conserved or approximately conserved charges. Because left and right handed particles carry different values of weak hypercharge, which is a conserved quantum number in the unbroken phase, we denoted the quantum number being reflected off the bubble wall as hypercharge, and noted that in the presence of nonzero hypercharge the free energy of the unbroken phase is

minimized for nonzero baryon number. Therefore anomalous electroweak baryon violating processes in the unbroken phase will lower the free energy by producing the baryons we see today, which eventually enter the bubbles of broken phase (where electroweak baryon number violation is extremely suppressed).

A potential problem for this baryogenesis mechanism is that weak hypercharge is gauged, and any long range gauge fields will be screened by the plasma. Khlebnikov [21] has solved the Vlasov equations for the particle distribution functions in the unbroken phase and finds that hypercharge can only extend over a distance of about $2/T$ in front of the bubble wall, whereas our simulation of the two Higgs doublet model (which only included quark scattering by gluon exchange, and neglected the tiny hypercharge field strength) found an asymmetry in the distribution functions between left handed top quarks and right handed top antiquarks over much larger distances. Top quark scattering with Higgs scalars does not conserve chirality, and hence will change the asymmetry in axial top quarks. However since all the scattering processes conserve several gauge and global charges, in general an asymmetry in left handed particle number persists when all scattering processes are in equilibrium. Screening of gauge charges is also important; the particle distribution functions will adjust themselves to cancel the net hypercharge carried by the top quarks outside the Debye length. Therefore one should worry that the calculation of the baryon number in ref. [10], which found a baryon production rate proportional to the net hypercharge in the plasma, is incorrect. Here we will show that while gauge screening does affect the fermion distribution functions, it has no effect on the total lefthanded fermion asymmetry, and hence no effect on baryogenesis.

Calculation of the baryon production rate becomes simple if the system is near thermal and chemical equilibrium. To compute the baryon production all one needs is Γ , the total rate for anomalous B -violating events per unit volume—parametrized as $\Gamma = \kappa \alpha_{\text{wk}}^4 T^4$ —and Δf , the change in the free energy per anomalous event. The parameter κ has been estimated to be of order $0.1 - 1.0$ [22], while Δf is

$$\Delta f = \sum_a \Delta q_a \mu_a . \quad (1)$$

Here a runs over all conserved or approximately conserved charges, Δq_a is the change in the a^{th} charge per anomalous event, and μ_a is the chemical potential for the charge a . Note that many other quantum numbers besides hypercharge are conserved or approximately conserved in the unbroken phase, such as baryon and lepton number. “Approximately

conserved” means that the time scale for processes which violate these quantum numbers is long when compared with the typical transport time τ_T that a reflected particle spends in the unbroken phase before the bubble wall catches up with it. This time was found to be between $10/T$ and $10^4/T$ in ref. [10]. Since anomalous events are slow ($\Gamma \ll T^3/\tau_T$) and the Yukawa couplings of light particles are small, all quantum numbers which are conserved by perturbative gauge interactions, scalar self couplings, and the top quark Yukawa interactions may be taken to be approximately conserved. To compute the rate of change of the baryon density, note that

$$\Delta f = \sum_a \Delta q_a \mu_a = \frac{1}{2} \sum_i \mu_i = \frac{1}{2} \sum_i \frac{6}{T^2} n_i = \frac{3}{T^2} n_L . \quad (2)$$

Here i runs over all fermions which are in weak doublets, μ_i is the chemical potential for the i^{th} particle, n_i is the number density of the i^{th} particle, and n_L is the net density of left handed weak doublet fermions. The factor of $\frac{1}{2}$ is present because a given event only involves one member of each weak doublet. The total rate of baryon creation per unit volume $\dot{\rho}_B$ in the unbroken phase is then just

$$\dot{\rho}_B = -\frac{\Delta f}{T} 3\Gamma = -3\kappa\alpha_{\text{wk}}^4 T^3 \sum_a \Delta q_a \mu_a , \quad (3)$$

where the factor of 3 accounts for the fact that the baryon number changes by 3 units per event. Our ignorance of the details of these anomalous baryon violating processes is subsumed into the parameter κ ; given this parameter, calculation of the baryon production rate reduces to a calculation of the chemical potentials μ_a for the various global and gauge charges.

The chemical potentials are calculated in a standard way by solving the linear equations

$$\rho_b = \sum_j q_j^b n_j = \sum_{j,a} q_j^b \frac{T^2}{6} k_j q_j^a \mu_a , \quad (4)$$

where ρ_b is the (fixed) charge density of the b^{th} conserved charge, the sum on j runs over all particle species, q_j^a is the value of the charge a carried by the j^{th} particle, and k_j is a statistical factor with $k_j = 1$ for every Weyl fermion and $k_j = 2$ for every charged boson which is much lighter than the temperature. For simplicity we choose a basis for the conserved charges such that

$$\sum_j k_j q_j^a q_j^b \propto \delta_{ab} , \quad (5)$$

(which we refer to as an orthogonal basis). With this basis, the number densities of the various charges will simply be proportional to their chemical potentials, which would not be true in a non-orthogonal basis.

In this basis, only the chemical potentials associated with gauge charges are affected by Debye screening. Since gauge charges are never anomalous, $\Delta q_a = 0$ whenever a is a gauge charge, which guarantees that $\dot{\rho}_B$ in eq. (3) is unaffected by the value of μ_Y . This is the essence of our argument that gauge charge screening does not affect baryogenesis.

This result may seem paradoxical in light of ref. [10] where it was shown that in several models where net hypercharge is reflected into the unbroken phase the baryon production rate is proportional to the hypercharge density. The resolution of the paradox is simple: ref. [10] did not use an orthogonal basis for the various approximately conserved charges. In an orthogonal basis, several conserved global quantum numbers which are orthogonal to hypercharge are reflected into the unbroken phase along with the net hypercharge. For instance, although no net baryon number is reflected (to lowest order in gauge coupling constants) there is a nonzero reflection of the quantum number $B' = B - xY$, where x is a constant chosen such that B' is orthogonal to Y . For example, in the three family standard model with n scalar weak doublets,

$$x = \frac{\sum_j k_j q_j^Y q_j^B}{\sum_j k_j (q_j^Y)^2} = \frac{2}{10 + n} . \quad (6)$$

Furthermore B' is changed by anomalous electroweak processes, and in the presence of nonzero B' there will be a bias toward producing net baryon number. The buildup of net hypercharge would produce a long range field, causing particles to move around in order to screen it; but the screening does not affect B' since B' is orthogonal to gauge charges.

In summary, the computation of the baryon production rate in the unbroken phase can be done as follows:

- 1) Find a basis where all approximately conserved global charges are mutually orthogonal, and orthogonal to all gauge charges. In this basis the Debye screening of gauge charges does not affect the chemical potentials for the global charges.
- 2) In the unbroken phase in front of the expanding bubble walls there will be net densities ρ_a for various global charges with weak anomalies resulting from charge transport of particles reflected from the bubbles. Compute these densities ρ_a ; it is convenient, although not necessary, to choose a basis where only one of these anomalous global charges is nonzero.

- 3) Compute the chemical potentials μ_a for the anomalous global charges from eq. (4). In an orthogonal basis the result is

$$\mu_a = \frac{6\rho_a}{T^2 \sum_j k_j (q_j^a)^2} \quad (7)$$

where j is summed over all particle species.

- 4) Compute the baryon production rate from eq. (3).

We can now redo the baryogenesis calculation of ref. [10], working in a basis where all global charges are orthogonal to hypercharge, and taking into account hypercharge screening through the chemical potential μ_Y . In this basis several global charges which are orthogonal to hypercharge are nonzero in the unbroken phase. Since the result for the baryon number production is independent of the chemical potential μ_Y , and also of course basis independent, we get exactly the same result for $\dot{\rho}_B$, as confirmed by explicit computation². We conclude that the charge transport mechanism is unaffected by Debye screening and dominates other baryon production mechanisms if the phase boundary is thin, of width $\lesssim \mathcal{O}(1/T)$.

Acknowledgments

We thank P. Diamond for useful conversations on plasma screening. A. C. was supported in part by DOE contracts #DE-AC02-89ER40509, #DE-FG02-91ER40676, by the Texas National Research Laboratory Commission grant #RGFY91B6, and NSF contract #PHY-9057173; A. N. and D. K. were supported in part by DOE contract #DE-FG03-90ER40546 and by fellowships from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation. D.K. was supported in part by NSF contract PHY-9057135. A.N. was supported in part by an SSC Fellowship from the Texas National Research Laboratory Commission.

² up to a factor of 3/2 which was an algebraic error in the computation of the baryon violation rate in ref. [10]. In that paper, eq. (C.2) should read $\mu_B = 2\rho_Y/((1+2n)T^2)$, and eq. (2.11) should be $\dot{\rho}_B = -(3\Gamma_B/T)(\partial F/\partial B)$.

References

- [1] A. Linde, Phys. Lett. 70B (1977) 306; S. Dimopoulos and L. Susskind, Phys. Rev. D18 (1978) 4500; N. Christ, Phys. Rev. D21 (1980) 1591; N.S. Manton, Phys. Rev. D28 (1983) 2019; F.R. Klinkhammer and N.S. Manton, Phys. Rev. D30 (1984) 2212
- [2] V.A. Kuzmin, V.A. Rubakov and M.E. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. 155B (1985) 36
- [3] P. Arnold and L. McLerran, Phys. Rev. D36 (1987) 581; Phys. Rev. D37 (1988) 1020; S. Khlebnikov and M. Shaposhnikov, Nucl. Phys. B308 (1988) 885; M. Dine, O. Lechtenfeld, B. Sakita, W. Fischler and J. Polchinski, Nucl. Phys. B342 (1990) 381
- [4] M.E. Shaposhnikov, JETP Lett. 44 (1986) 465; Nucl. Phys. B287 (1987) 757; Nucl. Phys. B299 (1988) 797; A. I. Bochkarev, S. Yu. Khlebnikov and M.E. Shaposhnikov, Nucl. Phys. B329 (1990) 493
- [5] L. McLerran, Phys. Rev. Lett. 62 (1989) 1075
- [6] A.G. Cohen, D.B. Kaplan and A.E. Nelson, Phys. Lett. 245B (1990) 561; Nucl. Phys. B349 (1991) 727
- [7] N. Turok and J. Zadrozny, Phys. Rev. Lett. 65 (1990) 2331; Nucl. Phys. B358 (1991) 471; L. McLerran, M. Shaposhnikov, N. Turok and M. Voloshin, Phys. Lett. 256B (1991) 451
- [8] M. Dine, P. Huet, R. Singleton and L. Susskind, Phys. Lett. 257B (1991) 351
- [9] A.G. Cohen, D.B. Kaplan and A.E. Nelson, Phys. Lett. 263B (1991) 86
- [10] A.E. Nelson, D.B. Kaplan and A.G. Cohen, Nucl. Phys. B373 (1992) 453
- [11] M.E. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. 277B (1992) 324
- [12] A.D. Sakharov, JETP Lett. 6 (1967) 24
- [13] M. Dine, R.G. Leigh, P. Huet, A. Linde and D. Linde, Slac preprint SLAC-PUB-5741 (1992); B.H. Liu, L. McLerran, and N. Turok, Minnesota preprint TPI-MINN-92/18-T (1992).
- [14] G.F. Guidice, Texas preprint UTTG-35-91 (1991); S. Myint, Boston University preprint BU-HEP-92-4 (1992)
- [15] A.G. Cohen, D.B. Kaplan and A.E. Nelson, work in progress
- [16] The wall thickness in the singlet majoron model for some parameters can be simply computed from the results of Y. Kondo, I. Umemura, and K. Yamamoto, Phys. Lett. 263B (1991) 86
- [17] A. Cohen and D.B. Kaplan, Phys. Lett. 199B (1988) 251; Nucl. Phys. B308 (1988) 913
- [18] M. Dine, P. Huet, and R. Singleton, UCSC preprint SCIPP-91-08 (1991), to appear in Nuclear Physics B
- [19] D. Grigoriev, M. Shaposhnikov, and N. Turok, Princeton preprint PUPT-91-1274 (1991)

- [20] L. McLerran, private communication; M. Dine, private communication; A. Dolgov, private communication
- [21] S. Yu. Khlebnikov, UCLA preprint UCLA/92/TEP/14 (1992)
- [22] J. Ambjorn, T. Askgaard, H. Porter and M. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. 244B (1990) 479